Approved For Release 2001/09/03 : CIA-RDP84-0070-R000400070138-0

Acting Executive

28 Jamer 1949

Omoral Counsel

Louve Regulations

- 1. We believe that the memorandian of the Personnel Officer, dated 27 January, presents a fair picture of a practical situation. We, however, approach the problem on a slightly different basis.
- 2. We feel that although a right may not in putatice be on oresed by the individuals concerned, it is, ribus the less, a right so long as it remains on the statute books. as presently worded. We believe, therefore, the the right to Leeve under the Act of Harch 14, 1986, as amended (S U.S.C. 30 B) is chaplute. The Civil Bergies Commission appears to agree to the extent that an employee theoretically. has recourse to the Court of Claims if the matter were brought to an issue. If our interpretation is correct (and we believe the Comptroller General's Opinions support us), the further words of the statute blint such leave shall be granted at much times as the heads of establishments may prescribe, give a control, but also impose a duty to see that such times are prescribed. It would obviously be an administrative absurdity to let a situation arise which would give grounds for possible action in the Court of Claims, when such a situation is conly avoided;
- for offices to ask their employees when they would orefore to take leave, and after the employees wishes are known the administrative officers set up leave schedules. Such a procedure would normally eliminate any difficulty under the Act. If an employee refuses to specify a time, he can be ordered on leave at a time convenient to the Covernment. This Ammey follows the normal Covernment practice of encouraging the taking of leave. Once the time for leave has been set, the Government's duty has been completed (unless, of course, it changes its plane before Leave is believe). Then if the employee, for plane before the reluses to take the leave as specified, he makes any right to claim leave at a different time under the Act, is this is clearly the type of protection which the employee is

would arise where an employee came to the last 26 working days of the year without asking for leave, being directed to take leave, or, by one measure or another, waiting leave. But if this specific situation areas, we still believe that the employee has a right to take these 26 days as annual leave, and that, even if it were administratively disapproved, and, possibly, pay were withheld by the Comptroller General, he could recover, in the Court of Claims, the arount of withheld pay and would be entitled to continue his same employment without being subject to any technical charge of missessance.

LAWRISION R. HOUDTON.

9.33/m13

cc: |4Uhrono |
Subject file
VLeral Implisions